Universal Extra Dimensions and the Graviton Portal to Dark Matter

Mathew Thomas Arun,[1, 2, *] Debajyoti Choudhury,[3, †] and Divya Sachdeva[3, ‡]

[1] *Department of Physics, Mar Thoma College, Thiruvalla 689 103, Kerala, India*
[2] *Center for High Energy Physics, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore-560 012, India*
[3] *Department of Physics and Astrophysics, University of Delhi, Delhi 110 007, India*

A unique 5-dimensional UED model emerges from a six dimensional space-time with nested warping. The AdS_6 bulk protects both the Higgs mass as well as the UED scale without invoking unnatural parameter values. The graviton excitations in the sixth direction open up new (co-)annihilation channels for the Dark Matter particle, thereby allowing for phenomenological consistency, otherwise denied to the minimal UED scenario.

PACS numbers:

arXiv:1703.04985v1 [hep-ph] 15 Mar 2017

The presence of dark matter (DM) in the universe and its dominance over luminous matter is well-established [1, 2]. What is not apparent, though, is its nature, a consequence of the lack of any evidence (direct or indirect) barring the astrophysical/cosmological context. Furthermore, the absence of any DM candidate within the Standard Model (SM) requires us to propose scenarios going beyond. The primary requirement is to have at least one component that is stable over cosmological times scales. Very often, this stability is guaranteed by a Z_2 symmetry, with the DM (and, possibly, its heavier cousins) being odd under it and all SM particles being even.

It would be particularly appealing if any such theory can also address at least some of the several other outstanding issues in the SM. Most notable of the latter are the hierarchy problem, the mechanism of generating the baryon asymmetry in the universe, the flavour problem (including the large hierarchy in the fermion masses), the unification of forces, etc.. Two particular classes that address most (if not all) of these issues are provided by supersymmetry and/or extra-dimensional scenarios. Here, we would be concentrating on the latter alternative.

The RS-model [3, 4] provided a particularly elegant resolution of the hierarchy, between the quantum-gravity scale M_5 and the electroweak scale v. through $v = \tilde{v}\,\exp(-\pi\,k_5\,r_c)$, where $\tilde{v} = \mathcal{O}(M_5)$ and k_5 denotes the bulk curvature, and r_c is the stabilized value of the modulus. Some of the aforementioned issues (as also proton decay and FCNC) can be addressed too if the SM gauge fields and fermions are not restricted to the TeV brane (as in the original RS model), but are promoted to 5-dimensional ones. Constraints from the electroweak precision tests as well as other low-energy observables necessitates the introduction of additional symmetries and fields, though. Existence of a viable DM-candidate requires even further additions. More damaging, though, is the non-observation of any Kaluza-Klein (KK) excitation of the graviton at the LHC, namely the constraint $m_1 \gtrsim 4\,\text{TeV}$ (at 95%C.L.) [5, 6] On the other hand, the model implies $m_n = x_n\,k_5\,\exp(-\pi\,k_5\,r_c)$, where x_n are the roots of the Bessel function of order one. With the applicability of semi-classical arguments (upon which the model hinges) as well as arguments relating the D3 brane tension to the string scale (and, hence, to M_5 through Yang-Mills gauge couplings) restricting $k_5/M_5 \lesssim 0.15$, one would, thus, expect the first KK-mode to be, at best, a few times heavier than the Higgs, and the nonobservation implies at least a little hierarchy.

The Universal Extra Dimension (UED) scenario [7, 8], on the other hand, envisages a flat compactified fifth dimension of radius R and a S^1/Z_2 orbifolding (so as to ensure that only the correct set of light fermions survive) with all the SM fields going in to the bulk. Although KK-number is broken, in the absence of any brane-localized terms in the Lagrangian, a Z_2-subgroup ("KK-parity") is retained. Given by $(-1)^n$ where n is the KK-level, this renders the lightest KK-excitation absolutely stable. With the mass of the n^{th} mode of a species (with a five-dimensional mass m_0) being given by

$$m_n^2 = m_0^2 + n^2/R^2\ , \tag{1}$$

clearly the excitations of a given level are nearly degenerate for $R^{-1} \gtrsim 1\,\text{TeV}$. However, quantum corrections (due to both the bulk fields as well as the orbifolding) provide additional splitting, resulting in $B^{(1)}$ (the first excitation of the hypercharge boson) being the lightest, and, hence, the DM candidate [9–12]. With all interactions being determined by the SM gauge action, the pair production of the KK-excitations at colliders is unsuppressed (barring kinematics), leading to the possibility of striking signatures[1]. The non-observation of such states at the LHC, whether it be monojet searches at $\sqrt{s} = 8\,\text{TeV}$ [13, 14] or multijets at $\sqrt{s} = 8\,\text{TeV}$ [15, 16], has been used to impose constraints of $R^{-1} \gtrsim 1150\,\text{GeV}$ [17]. Subsequent simulations [18, 19] suggest that the bound can be strengthened to $R^{-1} \gtrsim 1400\,\text{GeV}$. On the other hand, agreement with the observed DM energy density [1, 2] suggests that $R^{-1} \lesssim 1400\,\text{GeV}$ [20], an upper bound that

[1] Note that, in such models, there is no warping and, hence, the gravitons have only suppressed (M_{Pl}^{-1}) coupling to the rest, rendering them irrelevant to low-energy processes.

cannot be relaxed as the interactions are well-specified and the mass-differences constrained. A further refinement of the search strategies, including a count of (soft) particle multiplicities [21] would impose even stronger constraints. Thus, we are approaching an era of tension and the model stands to be comprehensively ruled out[2]. A further, and unrelated, problem with the UED paradigm is that there is no mechanism to stabilize the modulus R, thereby leaving it free to change with time, assuming any value.

Naturally Stabilised UED: To solve both these problems in a unified manner, we consider a six-dimensional space-time with successive (nested) warpings along the two compactified dimensions, which are individually Z_2-orbifolded with 4-branes sitting at each of the edges. The uncompactified directions (x^μ) support four-dimensional Lorentz symmetry. With the compact directions represented by the angular coordinates $x_{4,5} \in [0, \pi]$ and the corresponding moduli by R_y and r_z, the line element is, thus, given by [23]

$$ds_6^2 = b^2(x_5)[a^2(x_4)\eta_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu + R_y^2 dx_4^2] + r_z^2 dx_5^2 \ . \quad (2)$$

Starting with a bulk Einstein Hilbert action, defined by a characteristic scale M_6, augmented by a negative bulk cosmological constant Λ_6, the Einstein equations yield

$$\frac{3}{R_y^2}\left(\frac{a''}{a} + \frac{a'^2}{a^2}\right) + \frac{2}{r_z^2}\left(3\dot{b}^2 + 2b\ddot{b} + \frac{\Lambda_6\, r_z^2}{2M_6^4}b^2\right) = 0 \quad (3)$$

where primes(dots) denote derivatives with respect to x_4 (x_5). Here, we choose the branch that naturally yields a vanishing effective 4-dimensional cosmological constant (c.c.) [24]. Denoting

$$k = r_z\sqrt{-\Lambda_6/10\, M_6^4} \equiv r_z\, M_6\, \epsilon \quad (4)$$

we need to have $\epsilon \lesssim 0.15$ for a semi-classical treatment to be valid. The solution to eq.(3) is given by[23, 24]

$$b(x_5) = b_1 \cosh(k|x_5| + b_2) \ , \qquad a(x_4) = a_1\, e^{-c|x_4|} \quad (5)$$

where

$$b_1 = \sqrt{-\widetilde{\Omega}/2\, k^2} = \mathrm{sech}(k\pi + b_2) \ , \quad c \equiv b_1\, k\, R_y/r_z \ , \quad (6)$$

with $\widetilde{\Omega}$ being the constant of separation, to be identified with the c.c. induced on a 4-brane[24]. As is well-known [23], the warping (eq.5) can be large in only one of the two directions. In other words, we can either have large c and small k, or a large $k \sim 8$ and an infinitesimally small c. It is the latter branch that we would be interested in.

The graviton, now, has a tower of towers. The modes in the x_4-direction are given in terms of associated Legendre functions, while those in the x_4-direction are given in terms of Bessel functions [25]. This change, along with the fact of the hierarchy resolution now being shared between two warpings, results in the mass of the first KK-mode being significantly higher than that of the corresponding mode in the RS case. Furthermore, the large coupling enhancement that allowed for the RS-gravitons to be extensively produced at the LHC, is now tempered to a significant degree [25]. Consequently, the production rates are suppressed and the scenario easily survives the current bounds [25, 26].

Whereas the general solution of eqs.(5,6) is rather complicated, the limit $b_2 \to \infty$ is instructive and interesting. Now, c is infinitesimally small (or $a(x_4) \approx 1$), and

$$ds^2 \approx e^{2k(x_5-\pi)}[\eta_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu + R_y^2 dx_4^2] + r_z^2 dx_5^2 \ .$$

This metric is conformally flat and with AdS_6 bulk, it resembles a generalization of the Randall-Sundrum geometry in 5-dimensions. With this simplification, the 4-brane tensions are rendered pairwise equal and opposite [24], reflecting the vanishing of the induced c.c. on the branes[3]. With the space-time now close to being conformally flat, r_z can be stabilized (including backreaction) through a introduction of a bulk scalar with a quartic potential [24]. While the inclusion of the backreaction deforms the warping, we find that the resultant effect on the graviton spectrum and the couplings thereof is minimal. With the natural scale on the 4-brane at $x_5 = \pi$ now being warped down to the TeV-scale, a scalar localized on this brane would, naturally, stabilize R_y^{-1} to the same scale. Note that a non-zero, though small, value for c (c is of the same size as M_W/M_6) comes about naturally and is absolutely crucial for stabilizing R_y.

Considering the SM fields to be five-dimensional ones, defined on the entire 4-brane at $x_5 = \pi$, leads, now, to a naturally stabilized 5-dimensional UED-like scenario. With the Higgs field being localized on the TeV brane (the 4-brane located at $x_5 = \pi$), we have

$$m_{\rm Higgs} = \gamma\, r_z^{-1}\, e^{-k\pi} \ ,$$

a relation bearing close resemblance to the 5D one. Here, γ/r_z is the Higgs mass at the UV brane, (r_z^{-1} being the natural scale) with γ encompassing both the possible small hierarchy between the fundamental parameters

[2] While non-minimal versions can alter the spectrum, thereby possibly evading the problem, by evoking symmetric and tuned brane-localized terms in the Lagrangian [22], this is an ad hoc measure.

[3] This is not a fine-tuning, as the solutions are qualitatively similar, for the generic case as well. Moreover, the 4-dimensional c.c. is independent of the 5-dimensional one.

as well as quantum corrections to the measurables. In delineating parameter space, we use $1 > \gamma \gtrsim 0.7$.

Gravitons and their Interactions: With the Planck mass being given by

$$M_{\rm Pl}^2 = (M_6^3 R_y \pi/3\epsilon)\,[1 - \exp(-3k\pi)]\ ,$$

clearly $M_6 \ll M_{\rm Pl}$. Expanding the graviton wavefunction as

$$h_{\mu\nu}(x_\mu, x_4, x_5) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{R_y r_z}} \sum_{n,p} h_{\mu\nu}^{(n,p)}(x_\mu)\Psi_n(x_4)\chi_p(x_5)\ ,$$

the equation of motion for the x_5 component is

$$\left[\partial_5(b^5\partial_5) + m_p^2 b^3\right]\chi_p(x_5) = 0\ .$$

In this regime, the solution simplifies, in terms of $\tilde{z} \equiv e^{k(\pi - x_5)}$, from associated Legendre functions, to

$$\chi_p \approx N_p^{-1}\,\tilde{z}^{5/2}\left[J_{5/2}\left(m_p\, r_z\, k^{-1}\tilde{z}\right) + \beta_p Y_{5/2}\left(m_p\, r_z\, k^{-1}\tilde{z}\right)\right]$$

where the normalization N_p is determined from $\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dx_5\, b^3 \chi_p \chi_{p'} = \delta_{p,p'}$. The Neumann boundary conditions (χ_p' vanishing at both $x_5 = 0, \pi$) demand that β_p be vanishingly small and

$$m_p = k\, e^{-k\pi}\, r_z^{-1}\, x_p$$

where x_p are the roots of $J_{3/2}(x)$. As for the equation of motion for $\Psi_n(x_4)$, in this regime of small c, it is almost a flat Laplacian, and we have, for the masses of the 4-dimensional graviton modes $h_{\mu\nu}^{(n,p)}(x_\mu)$,

$$m_{np}^2 = p_4^2 + p_5^2 \approx n^2\, R_y^{-2} + m_p^2\ .$$

With the x_4-direction being nearly flat, $(-1)^n$ is a very good symmetry for gravitons and the SM-fields alike[4]. With the latter being expressible in terms of $\sin(n\,x_4)$ and $\cos(n\,x_4)$, we have, for the graviton interactions,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{\rm int.} &= \int_0^\pi \frac{dx_4}{M_6^2}\, h_{\mu\nu}(x_\mu, x_4, x_5 = 0) T^{\mu\nu}(x_\mu, x_4) \\ &= \sum_{p,n,n'} C_{n'}^{(n,p)} h_{\mu\nu}^{(n,p)}(x_\mu)\, T^{\mu\nu}_{(n,|n\pm n'|)}(x_\mu)\end{aligned} \qquad (7)$$

with the diagonal coupling

$$C_0^{(n,p)} = \frac{1}{M_6^2\,\sqrt{R_y r_z}}\,\chi_p(x_5 = 0)$$

being identical for all the gauge and fermion KK-modes. For $n' \neq 0$, the couplings are of similar size.

[4] The violation of this "KK-parity" would manifest itself, *e.g.*, in a DM lifetime of the order of the age of the universe.

The Relic Density: Owing to their near degeneracy in mass and similarity of couplings, the generic first KK-excitation does not decouple much earlier than the $B^{(1)}$. Consequently, they play an important role in determining the relic density n_B, not only through coannihilations, but also by replenishing $B^{(1)}$ through processes like $e^{(1)+}e^- \to B^{(1)} + \gamma$. Indeed, for mUED, the latter effect is strong enough that the inclusion of these excitations, especially the singlets, forces down R^{-1} by nearly 250 GeV [20, 27]. The exact magnitudes of such effect depends on the quantum corrections to the mass splittings, which, in turn, are determined by the cutoff scale Λ. Within the mUED, it has been suggested [28] that the stability of the Higgs potential restricts $\Lambda \lesssim 5R^{-1}$, but such bounds can be evaded. We consider, instead, two representative values, namely $\Lambda R_y = 4\,(35)$ corresponding to small (moderate) splittings.

In the stabilized version, the presence of the graviton excitations in the x_5-direction introduces additional diagrams both in the s- and t-channels (the latter, particularly, for coannihilations). However, given their somewhat smaller couplings, the gravitons (essentially, only $h^{(0,1)}$) would turn out to really manifest themselves in the s-channel. For an accurate computation of the relic density (known to be $\Omega h^2 = 0.1199 \pm 0.0022$ [1, 2]), we implemented our model (including the quantum-corrected couplings of the KK-2 states to SM particles [20]) in micrOMEGAs [29] using LanHEP [30]. As a check, we have compared against the CalcHEP model file discussed in Ref. [31].



FIG. 1: *Relic density contours for different values of R_y and Λ. Parameter points above the curves are allowed.*

With the graviton in play, an efficient annihilation mode opens up, thereby allowing a much heavier $B^{(1)}$ to be consistent with the relic density than was allowed within mUED (see Fig.1). Understandably, this process is most efficient close to the resonance, which, for the nonrelativistic DM particles, would occur when

$m_{01} \approx 2m(B^{(1)}) \sim 2R_y^{-1}$. In Fig.1, this is attested to by the severe dip in the size of the required coupling, as is shown by the lowest curve corresponding to the hypothetical case where all SM excitations other than the $B^{(1)}$ have been switched off (or $\Lambda R \to \infty$). The asymmetrical nature of the curve is a result of the interplay of three factors, the natural width of the $h^{(0,1)}$ which grows as the cube of its mass, the fact that the $B^{(1)}$ may have a small but nonzero momentum, and the functional dependence of the annihilation cross sections.

More realistic cases are represented by the other curves in Fig.1. While the salient features remain similar, the increase in the required coupling was expected in view of the discussions above. The dependence of the increase on Λ is but a reflection of the fact that a smaller Λ implies smaller splittings, and, hence, more states conspiring to increase n_B. Furthermore, as m_{01} grows sufficiently beyond $2m(B^{(1)})$, the graviton is allowed to decay into the other SM KK-excitations as well, thereby ameliorating the asymmetry. For small enough Λ and large enough m_{01} this effect clearly overcompensates.

Fig.2 displays the region in the parameter space that satisfies the relic density constraint as well as reproducing $m_{\rm Higgs} = 126$ GeV without invoking a substantial little hierarchy ($1 > \gamma \gtrsim 0.7$). For a given compactification radius R_y, the fundamental parameters k and ϵ are highly correlated, with the latter adopting moderate values consonant with a semiclassical treatment. It is particularly intriguing to note that the fundamental scale in such models is close to the left-right symmetry scale, namely $M_6 \sim 10^{14}$ GeV (with r_z^{-1} being a factor of 20–80 smaller). This is likely to have interesting implications for model building.



FIG. 2: *The region in the k–ϵ plane allowed by the relic density for two values of R_y. Difference between $\Lambda R = 4\,(35)$ is invisible on the scale of the graph.*

Conclusions and Outlook: The generalization of the RS paradigm to nested warping, thus, not only resolves the longstanding problem of the stabilization of the UED model (in turn, related to the mass hierarchy), but also the acute tension between the requirements imposed by the DM relic density on the one hand, and the non-observation at the LHC on the other. It is contingent upon us to examine the consistency of this model with other experiments. As for direct detection experiments, the smaller couplings (and at least twice as large a mass) of the gravitons alongwith the fact that they appear only in the t-channel renders their contribution to be vanishingly small. The DM-nucleon scattering cross sections, thus, are very similar to the mUED case, and for the parameter space in Fig.2, explicit calculations (using micrOMEGAs) yield numbers well below the strongest current limits [32]. As for indirect detection, the thermal-averaged annihilation cross sections for $B_1B_1 \to b\bar{b}/W^+W^-/ZZ/gg$ etc. are several orders of magnitude below the most restrictive limits from AMS-02[33] and Fermi-LAT[34]. On the other hand, the diphoton channel leads to monochromatic γs, and leads to rates that are very close to the upper limits deduced from HESS[35] using a particular galactic DM profile. It should be borne in mind, though, such bounds depend crucially on the specific profile chosen. Furthermore, choosing a moderately large value of ΛR_y and/or moving to a m_{01} somewhat greater than $2\,R_y^{-1}$ further suppresses such cross sections. Nonetheless, this would remain a particularly interesting channel.

DC acknowledges partial support from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant No 690575. DS would like to thank UGC-CSIR, India for financial assistance.

* Electronic address: thomas.mathewarun@gmail.com
† Electronic address: debajyoti.choudhury@gmail.com
‡ Electronic address: divyasachdeva951@gmail.com

[1] E. Komatsu et al. (WMAP), Astrophys. J. Suppl. **192**, 18 (2011), 1001.4538.
[2] P. A. R. Ade et al. (Planck), Astron. Astrophys. **594**, A13 (2016), 1502.01589.
[3] M. Gogberashvili, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **D11**, 1635 (2002), hep-ph/9812296.
[4] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3370 (1999), hep-ph/9905221.
[5] V. Khachatryan et al. (CMS), Phys. Lett. **B767**, 147 (2017), 1609.02507.
[6] The ATLAS collaboration, Tech. Rep. ATLAS-CONF-2016-018, CERN, Geneva (2016), URL `http://cds.cern.ch/record/2141568`.
[7] T. Appelquist, H.-C. Cheng, and B. A. Dobrescu, Phys. Rev. **D64**, 035002 (2001), hep-ph/0012100.
[8] H.-C. Cheng, K. T. Matchev, and M. Schmaltz, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 056006 (2002), hep-ph/0205314.
[9] K. Kong and K. T. Matchev, JHEP **01**, 038 (2006), hep-ph/0509119.
[10] G. Servant and T. M. P. Tait, Nucl. Phys. **B650**, 391 (2003), hep-ph/0206071.

[11] H.-C. Cheng, J. L. Feng, and K. T. Matchev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 211301 (2002), hep-ph/0207125.
[12] D. Hooper and S. Profumo, Phys. Rept. **453**, 29 (2007), hep-ph/0701197.
[13] V. Khachatryan et al. (CMS), Eur. Phys. J. **C75**, 235 (2015), 1408.3583.
[14] G. Aad et al. (ATLAS), Eur. Phys. J. **C75**, 299 (2015), [Erratum: Eur. Phys. J.C75,no.9,408(2015)], 1502.01518.
[15] The ATLAS collaboration, Tech. Rep. ATLAS-CONF-2015-062, CERN, Geneva (2015).
[16] V. Khachatryan et al. (CMS), Phys. Lett. **B758**, 152 (2016), 1602.06581.
[17] D. Choudhury and K. Ghosh, Phys. Lett. **B763**, 155 (2016), 1606.04084.
[18] N. Deutschmann, T. Flacke, and J. S. Kim (2017), 1702.00410.
[19] J. Beuria, A. Datta, D. Debnath, and K. T. Matchev (2017), 1702.00413.
[20] G. Belanger, M. Kakizaki, and A. Pukhov, JCAP **1102**, 009 (2011), 1012.2577.
[21] S. Chakraborty, S. Niyogi, and K. Sridhar (private communication).
[22] T. Flacke, D. W. Kang, K. Kong, G. Mohlabeng, and S. C. Park (2017), 1702.02949.
[23] D. Choudhury and S. SenGupta, Phys. Rev. **D76**, 064030 (2007), hep-th/0612246.
[24] M. T. Arun and D. Choudhury (2016), 1606.00642.
[25] M. T. Arun, D. Choudhury, A. Das, and S. SenGupta, Phys. Lett. **B746**, 266 (2015), 1410.5591.
[26] M. T. Arun and P. Saha (2015), 1512.06335.
[27] J. M. Cornell, S. Profumo, and W. Shepherd, Phys. Rev. **D89**, 056005 (2014), 1401.7050.
[28] A. Datta and S. Raychaudhuri, Phys. Rev. **D87**, 035018 (2013), 1207.0476.
[29] G. Belanger, F. Boudjema, A. Pukhov, and A. Semenov, Comput. Phys. Commun. **176**, 367 (2007), hep-ph/0607059.
[30] A. Semenov, Comput. Phys. Commun. **201**, 167 (2016), 1412.5016.
[31] A. Belyaev, M. Brown, J. Moreno, and C. Papineau, JHEP **06**, 080 (2013), 1212.4858.
[32] D. S. Akerib et al. (LUX), Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, 021303 (2017), 1608.07648.
[33] S.-J. Lin, X.-J. Bi, P.-F. Yin, and Z.-H. Yu (2015), 1504.07230.
[34] M. Ackermann et al. (Fermi-LAT), Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 231301 (2015), 1503.02641.
[35] A. Abramowski et al. (H.E.S.S.), Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 041301 (2013), 1301.1173.